

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS ... P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/051,860	01/16/2002	Eric Bergman	263/169 P01-0007	1640
34055	7590 05/05/2004		EXAMINER	
PERKINS COIE LLP			STINSON, FRANKIE L	
POST OFFICE BOX 1208 SEATTLE, WA 98111-1208			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SEATTLE, V	VA 70111-1200		1746	
			DATE MAILED: 05/05/200	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding....

		- #>			
Application No.	Applicant(s)				
10/051,860	BERGMAN, ERIC	.			
Examiner	Art Unit				
FRANKIE L. STINSON	1746				
opears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address				
	a reply be timely filed thirty (30) days will be considered timely. ONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
March 2004.					
nis action is non-final.					
 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i>, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. 					
		6			
e withdrawn from conside	eration.				
•					
ccepted or b) objected	to by the Examiner.				
		D.			
		r			
ents have been received. ents have been received in riority documents have be eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	n Application No een received in this National Stage	•			
·					
4) Tintervi	ew Summary (PTO-413)				
Paper	No(s)/Mail Date of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)				
	Examiner FRANKIE L. STINSON Opears on the cover sheet LY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3	10/051,860 BERGMAN, ERIC Examiner Art Unit 1746 Depears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address			

Art Unit: 1746

- 1. Claims 4, 519 and 30 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in papers filed March 8, 2004.
- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-3, 7-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japan 4-125927 (Japan'927) in view of either Miki et al., Kanno et al., or Japan 7-155714 (Japan'714).

Re claim 1, Japan'927 is cited disclosing an apparatus for processing a workpiece comprising: a liquid supply source (8); one or more liquid outlets (10) disposed to apply liquid onto the workpiece; a liquid flow line (unnumbered) extending between the liquid supply source and the one or more liquid outlets for carrying liquid to the liquid outlets, at least one heater (3) for heating the liquid before it is applied onto the workpiece, an ozone gas supply system (6) which provides ozone gas around the workpiece (note that Japan'927 discloses an "ozone atmosphere") that differs from the claim only in the recitation of the sonic energy source for introducing sonic energy to the workpiece. Miki, Kanno and Japan'714 are each cited disclosing an arrangement for processing a workpiece, where there is provided a sonic energy source (602, 605 in Miki, 69 in Kanno; 3 in Japan'714) for introducing sonic energy to the workpiece. It therefore would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of

Art Unit: 1746

Japan'927, to include a sonic energy source for introducing sonic energy to the workpiece as taught by either Miki, Kanno or Japan'714, since Miki for example, suggests that by "applying high frequency sound waves" it is possible to "increase the washing effects" and to "shorten washing time" (see Miki col. 6, line 64-67) and Kanno for example, suggests that the use of ultrasonic waves results in the surface of the workpiece being "uniformly cleaned" (see Kanno col. 8, lines 43-48) as is well known in the art. Re claim 2, Kanno and Japan'714 disclose the sonic energy conductor in contact with the workpiece. Re claim 3, Miki is cited disclosing the arrangement of employing quartz, silicon, metal or a polymer (see col. 4, line 12 -28). Re claim 7, Japan'927 discloses the liquid supply source as claimed. Re claim 8, Japan'927 and Miki disclose the ozone supply as claimed . Re claim 8, Japan'927 discloses the recirculation. Re claim 11, Japan'927 discloses the nozzles (10). Re claim 12, Miki discloses (see col. 7, lines 5-8 and col. 8, lines 15-22) that it is necessary to form a film on the surface of the workpiece, where the thickness of the film must bet set to "optimal". It is therefore understood by the examiner that means for controlling the thickness is inherently provided. Therefore to modify the device of Japan'927 to have a controlled film, as taught by Miki, for the purpose of enhancing the cleaning process would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art. Re claim 13, Japan'927 and Miki disclose flow control means as claimed. Re claim 14, Japan'927 discloses the spray nozzles. Re claim 15, to have thickness controlling means being that of a rotor, is deemed to be an obvious matter of design. To employ one means for controlling film

Art Unit: 1746

thickness versus another is deemed to be an obvious substitution of equivalents (see MPEP 2144.06).

- 4. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the applied prior art as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Schoeppel.

 Claim 6 defines over the applied prior art only in the recitation of the liquid supply source including a heater for heating the liquid in reservoir. Japan'927 disclose the heating of the liquid at the chamber, therefore, Schoeppel is cited disclosing in an apparatus for treating a workpiece, a liquid supply source having a reservoir (10) with a heater (13) located therein for heating the liquid in the reservoir. It therefore would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the apparatus Japan'927, to have a heater in the reservoir as taught by Schoeppel, since this is deemed to be an obvious substitution of equivalents (see MPEP 2144.06).
- 5. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the applied prior art as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of European Patent Office 890,658 (EPO'658).

Claim 10 defines over the applied prior art only in the recitation of the rotor assembly for rotating the workpiece. EPO'658 is cited disclosing in an apparatus for treating a workpiece, where there is provided a rotor assembly (80) for rotating the workpiece. It therefore would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of Japan'927, to include a rotor as taught by EPO'658, for the purpose of ensuring for the complete exposure of the workpiece's surface to the treatment fluid as is common in the art.

Art Unit: 1746

6. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either European Patent Office 548,596 (EPO'596) or European Patent Office 782,177 (EPO'177) in view of either Japan 5-136045 (Japan'045) or Japan 9-139345 (Japan'345).

Re claim 31, EPO'596 and EPO'177 are each cited disclosing an apparatus for cleaning a workpiece, comprising: a process chamber (1 in EPO'596; 10 in EPO'177), a workpiece holder (5 in EPO'596; 14 in EPO'177) within the process chamber an ozone supply system (6, 7 in EPO'596; 12 in EPO'177) for delivering ozone into the process chamber and a liquid supply source (8, 9 in EPO'596; 11 in EPO'177) for delivering a liquid onto the workpiece that differs from the claim only in the recitation of the sonic energy source on the workpiece holder for introducing sonic energy to a workpiece held on the workpiece holder. Japan'045 and Japan'345 are both cited disclosing in an apparatus for treating workpieces, the arrangement of treating the surface of a workpiece where there is provided a sonic energy source (7 in Japan'045 and 18 in Japan'345) on the workpiece holder for introducing sonic energy to a workpiece held on the workpiece holder. It therefore would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of either EPO'596 or EPO'177, to include a sonic energy source as taught by either Japan'045 or Japan'345, for the purpose of enhancing the treating process and for ensuring uniformity in treatment throughout the surface of the workpiece as is common in the art.

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1746

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Miki et al.

Re claim 32 (see fig. 6a, 6b), Miki is cited disclosing an apparatus for treating the surface of a workpiece comprising: a process chamber, a workpiece holder (606) within the process chamber for holding a workpiece, a liquid supply source (610) for delivering a liquid to a surface of the workpiece to form a liquid layer on the workpiece surface means (see col. 7, lines 5-8 and col. 8, lines 15-22) for controlling a thickness of the liquid layer formed on the workpiece surface; an ozone supply system (see fig. 9) for delivering ozone into the process chamber (via a liquid carrier), and a sonic energy source (605) in mechanical or fluid contact with the liquid layer on the workpiece surface for delivering sonic energy through the liquid layer to the workpiece surface.

- 9. Claims 16-18 are allowed.
- 10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 6-18, 31 and 32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. In Taniyama, Kobyashiu et al., Degendt et al. Tomita et al., Japan'427, japan'930, Japan'566, Japan'188 and Arii, note the workpiece treating means.

Page 7

Application/Control Number: 10/051,860

Art Unit: 1746

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FRANKIE L. STINSON whose telephone number is (571) 272-1308. The examiner can normally be reached M-F from 5:30 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. and some Saturdays from 5:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700 (571) 272-1700.

Any inquiry for missing parts of this Office Action (copies of references, pages, forms etc.), contact the TEAM LEADER Ms. Nicol Scott (571) 272-1045.

fls

FRANKIE L. STINSON Primary Examiner Art Unit 1746